

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSENDER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wopto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/531,809	04/18/2005	Thierry Granier	102790-189 (30061 US)	3684
NORRIS MC	7590 03/11/200 LAUGHLIN & MARC	EXAMINER		
875 THIRD AVE 18TH FLOOR NIEW YORK, NY 10022			NGUYEN, THUY-AI N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1796	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/11/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Application No. Applicant(s) GRANIER ET AL. 10/531,809

Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	THUY-AI N. NGUYEN	1796	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	idress
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If No period for reply is generally assume the maining date of the communication	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a repty be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this of D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 AI     2a)□ This action is FINAL. 2b)⊠ This     3)□ Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final.		e merits is
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1.2 and 10-19 is/are pending in the ap 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrav 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1.2 and 10-19 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b)  objected to by the I drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	a 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 C	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) 🖾 Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) 🖾 All b) 🗆 Some * c) 🗀 None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau.  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list.	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National	Stage
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/Bir08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 04/18/2005.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate	

Attachment(s)		
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Annuary Review (PTO-948) 3) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Annuary Review (PTO-948) 4) Notice of Patent Pto Pto Pto Pto Pto Pto Pto Pto Pto Pt	4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper Nots/Mail Date. 5) Notice of Informal Pater Lapplication 6) Other:	
C. Datastand Vandamant Office		

Art Unit: 1796

#### DETAILED ACTION

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112/101

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-2, and 10- 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-2, and 10- 14 are provides for the use of cyclooctenyl compound of formula I, but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

Claims 1-2, and 10- 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products*, *Ltd.* v. *Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

Art Unit: 1796

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-2, and 10- 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Freerksen et al. (Journal of Organic Chemistry, 1983, vol. 48, pages 4087- 4096).

Regarding claims 1-2, and 10- 14, Freerksen et al. teach the 1-cyclooctene-1enyelthanone that has the similar structure as claimed by the applicant, wherein X is carbonyl, and R is ethane, and the double bond is in the position between C1 and C2 (table 2, compound n, p. 4092).

However, Cantrell et al. do not teach that the compound is able to use as fragrance. The Office realizes that all of the claimed effects or physical properties are not positively stated by the reference(s). However, the reference(s) teaches all of the claimed ingredients. Therefore, the claimed effects and physical properties, i.e. being use in fragrance application, household product, laundry product, body card product or cosmetic would implicitly be achieved by a composition with all the claimed ingredients. If it is the applicant's position that this would not be the case: (1) evidence would need to be provided to support the applicant's position; and (2) it would be the Office's position that the application contains inadequate disclosure that there is no teaching as to how to obtain the claimed properties with only the claimed ingredients.

Art Unit: 1796

Claims 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cantrell et al. (Journal of Organic Chemistry, 1971, vol. 36, pages 670 – 676).

Regarding claim 17, Cantrell et al. teach the acetyl cyclooctene compound (5 and 6) that has the similar structure as claimed by the applicant, wherein X is carbonyl, and R is methyl, and the double in the position of the compound la and Ic as claimed by the applicant (p. 671).

Claim 18 is rejected 102(a) by Bajgrowicz et al. (Bioorganic and Medicinal Chemistry, 2003, vol. 11, pages 2931- 2946),

Regarding claim 18, Bajgrowicz et al. teach 1-cyclyocten-1-yl- 4- pentene-1-one compound (compound 28d, table 1. p. 2934), wherein X is carbonyl, double bond is in position between C1 and C2, and R is pentenone.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 15- 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freerksen et al. (Journal of Organic Chemistry, 1983, vol. 48, pages 4087- 4096) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Markert et al. (US. 6,555,517).

Art Unit: 1796

Regarding to claims 15 and 16, Freerksen et al. teach the 1-cyclooctene-1enylethanone compound. However, Freerksen et al. do not teach the method of
manufacturing a fragrance composition from the compound as claimed. Markert et al.
teach the method of making a fragrance composition from the 4-cyclooctene aldehyde
(abstract, and col 3: 15-41). Because cyclooctene aldehyde and 1-cyclooctene-1enyelthanone compounds have the same bone structure of cyclooctene and the
functional group carbonyl, they would have similar properties. At the time of the
invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to substitute 1cyclooctene-1-enylethanone for 4-cyclooctyl aldehyde in the fragrance composition for
the same purpose of using 4-cyclooctyl aldehyde as perfume or perfume booster
(Markert et al., col. 3: 15 - 20, and MPEP, 2144.09).

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freerksen et al. (Journal of Organic Chemistry, 1983, vol. 48, pages 4087- 4096).

Regarding claim 19, Freerksen et al. teach the 1-cyclooctene-1-enyelthanone that has the similar structure as claimed by the applicant, wherein X is carbonyl, and R is ethane, and the double bond is in the position between C1 and C2 (table 2, compound n, p. 4092).

However, the compound does not have the double bond in the position of C4 as claimed by the applicant. A prima facie case of obviousness may be made when chemical compounds have very close structural similarities and similar utilities. "An obviousness rejection based on similarity in chemical structure and function entails the

Art Unit: 1796

motivation of one skilled in the art to make a claimed compound, in the expectation that compounds similar in structure will have similar properties." In re Payne, 606 F.2d 303, 313, 203 USPQ 245, 254 (CCPA 1979). See In re Papesch, 315 F.2d 381, 137 USPQ 43 (CCPA 1963) (discussed in more detail below) and In re Dillon, 919 F.2d 688, 16 USPQ2d 1897 (Fed. Cir. 1991) (discussed below and in MPEP § 2144) for an extensive review of the case law pertaining to obviousness based on close structural similarity of chemical compounds. See also MPEP § 2144.08, paragraph II.A.4.(c).

## Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to THUY-AI N. NGUYEN whose telephone number is (571)270-3294. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday: 8:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m. eastern time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Eashoo can be reached on 571-272-1197. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/531,809 Page 7

Art Unit: 1796

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Mark Eashoo/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1796 5-Mar-08 February 29, 2008

Patent Examiner Thuy- Ai N. Nguyen